DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 461 900 CS 510 746

AUTHOR Williamson, L. Keith
TITLE The Pedagogy of Pedagogy: Teaching GTAs To Teach.
PUB DATE 2001-04-00
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Popular Culture Association and the American Culture Association Conference (Philadelphia, PA, April 11-14, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Course Descriptions; *Graduate Students; Higher Education; *Introductory Courses; *Public Speaking; *Teaching Assistants; Teaching Methods; Workshops

ABSTRACT

A long-standing aspect of collegiate culture at many advanced-degree-granting universities is the use of Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) to teach an introductory course. This practice presents a serious pedagogical challenge--namely, how to train inexperienced GTAs to teach the course. Too often new GTAs are merely supplied with the textbook and told to "go teach." A more productive response to the challenge is to teach an intensive graduate workshop required of all GTAs on the pedagogy of the introductory course. This paper describes the philosophy and methodology of one such workshop with a successful track record of nearly 30 years to train GTAs to teach the basic (public speaking) course. (Contains 32 references. Appendixes contain course requirements; the undergraduate syllabus course outline; an excerpt from the basic course curriculum guide; and an excerpt from the GTA workshop syllabus.) (Author/RS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 461 900

The Pedagogy of Pedagogy: Teaching GTAs to Teach

L. Keith Williamson

Elliott School of Communication

Wichita State University

1845 Fairmount

Wichita, KS 67260-0031

Phone: (316) 978-6057

e-mail: keith_williamson@elliott.es.twsu.edu

Presented at the Annual Meeting

of the Popular Culture Association

Philadelphia, PA

April 11 - 14, 2001

Running Head: Pedagogy of Pedagogy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. K. Williamson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS 510 746

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

A long-standing aspect of collegiate culture at many advanced-degree-granting universities is the use of Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) to teach an introductory course. This practice presents a serious pedagogical challenge--namely, how to train inexperienced GTAs to teach the course. Too often new GTAs are merely supplied with the textbook and told to "go teach." A more productive response to the challenge is to teach an intensive graduate workshop required of all GTAs on the pedagogy of the introductory course. This paper describes the philosophy and methodology of one such workshop with a successful track record of nearly thirty years.

The Pedagogy of Pedagogy: Teaching GTAs to Teach

The proper training of graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) is an issue of long-standing importance (if not significant financial support) in the university. Such assistantships began in the late 1800s merely as a stipend, but grading and ultimately teaching responsibilities were added after W.W.II (Hendrix, 1995). At major research universities, full-time faculty have increasingly focused on teaching graduate courses and conducting research (Boyer, 1991), leaving the teaching of many freshmen-level courses to GTAs. The importance of preparing GTAs is recognized across disciplines (Amores, 1999; D'Andrea, 1996; Duba-Biedermann, 1994; Gilbreath & Slater, 1994; New Emphasis, 1997; Sebald, Courter, Lewis, & Baker, 1997). GTAs themselves have concerns about teaching (Feezel & Myers, 1997). At the university level (as opposed to the departmental level), any training that is provided tends to be limited to one day and centered on university procedures and policies rather than actual instructional delivery (Shannon, Twale, & Moore, 1998), sometimes with some type of resource handbook provided (Instructional Resource Booklet, 1987).

In order to address GTA needs (Connelly, 1982, Worthen, 1992), various approaches to preparation have been identified. One is mentorship by experienced faculty (Boyle & Boise, 1998; Civikly & Hidalgo, 1992), which GTAs have regularly recommended (Bomotti, 1994; Jones, 1993). However, the number of faculty mentors is limited by pressure on faculty to publish and other factors (Shannon et al., 1998). Peer mentoring by experienced GTAs is another option (Hendrix, 1999). Numerous other training models have been suggested (Hugenberg, 1991), including training the trainer (Nyquist & Wulff, 1986) and team-building (Mandeville & Blakemore, 1994). It has consistently been found that there is a relative lack of formal teacher training for GTAs (Savage & Sharpe, 1998). About half of GTAs surveyed received no actual teacher preparation courses (Bomotti, 1994) or any other formal training (Gray & Buerkel-

Rothfuss, 1991). What training there is tends to be brief with minimal follow-up (Rushin et al., 1997) and consists mostly of staff meetings and course orientations (Yoder & Hugenberg, 1980), predominately of one day or less in length at the beginning of the semester (Buerkel-Rothfuss & Gray, 1990). Clearly, more GTA training at the departmental level is needed (Shannon et al., 1998).

One model for GTA training is the departmental workshop (Lumsden, 1993; Williamson & Smith, 1981). More departments of speech communication than other disciplines appear to be training GTAs, but not necessarily offering much breadth or scope of training (Buerkel-Rothfuss & Gray, 1990). The departmental workshop offered by the Basic Oral Communication Program in the Elliott School of Communication at Wichita State University has been used successfully for almost thirty years to train GTAs to teach the basic (public speaking) course. This paper describes first the philosophy and second the pedagogical methodology of this workshop approach, as a model of potential usefulness in various disciplines.

Philosophy of the Workshop

Since the pedagogy of the GTA workshop is dependent in part upon the pedagogy of the basic course which the GTAs will ultimately be teaching, it is necessary to explain at the outset the pedagogy of the basic course. The philosophy of GTA training in this workshop model is based upon the pedagogical assumption that the School's Basic Oral Communication Program (administered by a director with a faculty advisory committee) is responsible for structuring the entire curriculum of the basic (public speaking) course, which is a basic skills requirement in the University's General Education program. It is important for the basic course to be standardized for at least two reasons. First, the content and structure of the basic course should be determined by the wisdom and experience of qualified regular faculty (especially the basic course director), not by GTAs (whether experienced or inexperienced as teachers). It is not fair to shove the textbook at GTAs and tell them to "teach it," as if they should automatically know how to do so. Neither is it

reasonable to expect them to know what kinds of class format (lecture, discussion, etc.) and assignments (essay, objective exams, oral performances, etc.) are standard in the discipline. Second, the basic course needs to be designed with the needs in mind of the undergraduate students who will be taking it, who should have a comparably equivalent educational experience in the course regardless of whether their particular course section is taught by a GTA, regular faculty member, or lecturer. Consequently, the workshop model described in this paper involves multiple levels of curricular awareness--namely, from the viewpoints of the undergraduate student taking the course, of the GTA, and of the experienced regular faculty member (whether as a teacher of the course or as a member of the advisory committee).

One way to indicate the standardized nature of the basic course curriculum is by describing the locally-produced fifty-three page handbook (Williamson & Morris, 2001) that all undergraduate students in the course must buy and all instructors (including lecturers and regular faculty) must follow. This handbook is divided into three sections (besides the title page and table of contents): the syllabus (8 pages), evaluation forms for speeches and other assignments (26 pages), and additional resources (17 pages of "handouts" from the textbook author and from the local course director). Perhaps the foundation for detailed course standardization is the use of a single textbook in all course sections. In the case of the basic (public speaking) course at Wichita State, the textbook is by Lucas (2001a), one of the most widely-used textbooks nationally for such courses. The use of a common textbook allows all locally-produced course materials (such as the handbook, exams, evaluation forms, etc.) to be keyed to and coordinated with that single text. Similarly, the instructor's manual (Lucas, 2001b) is most helpful in standardizing the curriculum, since it contains detailed pedagogical instructions, (chapter outlines as an aid to lecturing, various discussion questions including how to conduct and process classroom discussion of them, handouts, etc.).

There are two aspects of the syllabus in the handbook that especially illustrate the standardized curriculum. The first is the listing of course requirements (Appendix A, point 9). Each assignment in the course is the same in all course sections, and carries the same weight in the total course grade. The only exception is within the minor category of "variable points (pop quizzes, etc.)"; the particular instructor has discretion about how many quizzes, brief homework assignments, etc., are included within this twenty-point category. These standard course requirements are useful in several ways, because they allow GTAs to be trained uniformly on how to make and grade assignments, and because they permit undergraduate students with compelling need to transfer from one section to another during the semester to do so without confusion about their class performance and grade.

The second illustrative aspect of the syllabus is the "Undergraduate Syllabus Course Outline " (Appendix B). As this week-by-week schedule shows, the sequence of topics covered in the course are different than the order of chapters in the texbook. This fact reflects the program's structuring the curriculum around locally-determined incremental learning objectives. (Undergraduates start by giving very brief, simple speeches, followed by increasingly longer and more complex speeches; reading assignments from Lucas are assigned accordingly to prepare students to do these incrementally more complex speaking tasks). Examinations are also structured by the program. The mid-term exam (week 8) is loosely structured. It is a listening-comprehension exam consisting of true-false questions (based on Lucas and chosen by each instructor from a common list) read aloud by the instructor, plus some essay or short-answer questions. The final exam (week 16) is a completely-standardized, program-wide exam, multiple-choice in format, computer-scored, curved (norm-referenced) by the program director . It is based mostly on questions from the textbook author's computerized test bank, and is not provided to instructors in advance (to avoid any tendency to teach to the exam).

While the use of a common syllabus is one key to standardizing the basic course curriculum, another is the use of a curriculum guide (excerpted in Appendix C), which is a detailed set of lesson plans for the basic course coordinated with the weekly schedule in the syllabus. As Appendix C (the excerpt from the basic course curriculum guide for part of week 1 and all of week 2) indicates, the pedagogical method used in this particular basic course is predominantly activity/exercise, relying on undergraduate students having read the assignment in advance and largely (but not entirely) eliminating the need for GTAs to lecture the material. Normally for each 50-minute class period, a given activity or exercise based in most cases on Lucas (2001a) is stipulated. Such required exercises are described for undergraduates in the textbook, with detailed instructions on how to conduct the exercises provided to GTAs in the instructor's manual (Lucas, 2001b) and with additional directions sometimes included in the curriculum guide. For example in the curriculum guide (Appendix C, week 2, 2nd 50 min.), the concept of purpose statements is taught by (1) briefly lecturing the tips about purpose statements in the textbook; and (2) using two exercises provided to undergraduates in the Lucas (2001a) text and reprinted for their convenience in the handbook, along with explicit instructions on conducting the exercises in the instructor's manual (Lucas, 2001b). The students work on each exercise within small groups, followed by class discussion. For most weeks, supplemental optional exercises are listed within square brackets in the curriculum guide (see Appendix C, week 1, last entries for 3rd 50 min.), for use by instructors who have additional class time available after completing all required activities. For lecture-based courses, a comparable curriculum guide could easily be designed, with reference to detailed chapter outlines (in an instructor's manual or locally-produced instructor's supplement), overheads or PowerPoint slides, and other lecture aids. Increasingly, national textbooks also are providing such supplemental pedagogical resources as web pages, CD-ROMs for students, outlines on computer disks, student study guides, etc.

Methodology of the Workshop

The pedagogy of the GTA workshop is to teach GTAs about the pedagogy of the basic course. Because of the philosophy of basic course standardization (as evident in the common syllabus and the curriculum guide), the methodology of the workshop can now be addressed. The workshop, required of all new GTAs and carrying three graduate credit hours, is two weeks in length immediately preceding registration week for the fall semester and meets daily for four and one-half hours. The pedagogical plan of the workshop is two-level in nature. First, it covers the entire undergraduate basic course curriculum (following the course outline in the common syllabus but in a more rapid fashion than with undergraduates), so that GTAs can experience essentially the entire undergraduate course in the workshop. Second, it examines the pedagogy of the basic course (following the curriculum guide). This dual focus requires GTAs in the workshop to understand the course as if they were both an undergraduate basic course student and a teacher of the course (which they soon will be). As a result, the workshop syllabus refers both to the common basic course syllabus in the handbook as well as the instructor's curriculum guide. GTAs experience the undergraduate course curriculum by doing all the required activities and by taking the undergraduate midterm and final exams (which count in the workshop grade). An illustration of how the GTA workshop covers the basic course curriculum is provided in Appendix D (GTA Workshop Syllabus Excerpt). This excerpt indicates how part of the first and all of the second weeks of the basic course are covered in less than two days in the GTA workshop.

In addition, GTAs are placed in the instructor role through the use of microteaching --the practice of teaching before peers and faculty for the sake of experience and feedback prior to facing a classroom of undergraduate students (Shannon et al., 1998). Each GTA is assigned a different required activity, exercise or lecture in the common undergraduate syllabus to conduct, and does so at the time that the specified activity occurs in the workshop coverage of the undergraduate course outline. After each such microteaching

session, the course director offers a critique and additional guidance about teaching that exercise to undergraduates. The grading of each of the major undergraduate student speeches is also practiced in the workshop by using videotapes of actual student speeches (who have consented in writing in advance to the use of their tapes in this manner). Likewise, sample written assignments (outlines and exams) are also graded by GTAs in the workshop, with the entire workshop group then discussing the various grades in order to develop grading consistency.

Of course, the more general or less discipline-based dimensions of the teaching role are also discussed in the workshop. One is discussion of a required workshop text on teaching tips (McKeachie, 1999) regarding such topics as organizing effective discussions, dealing with cheating, etc., Another aspect of familiarizing GTAs with the general teaching role is through detailed descriptions of specific relevant program, departmental and university policies (such as dealing with academic dishonesty and problematic classroom behavior, assisting students with special learning needs, etc.). These kinds of policy issues as well as curricular matters are discussed as needed throughout the academic year at weekly GTA staff meetings with the program director.

How should one teach GTAs to teach? The philosophy of the GTA workshop described in this paper is to teach the pedagogy of the standardized basic course (using the common syllabus and curriculum guide). The methodology of the workshop is to have GTAs function pedagogically on each of two levels--as undergraduate students taking the basic course (experiencing the entire standardized curriculum in a rapid fashion), and as teachers conducting classroom activities and then reflecting upon their teaching experience. The pedagogy of how to teach GTAs to teach the basic course is piggybacked on the pedagogy of the basic course itself. This model is offered as one example of a successful approach to training GTAs.

References

Amores, M. J. (1999). Preparing graduate teaching assistants: An investment in excellence. Foreign Language Annals, 32, 441.

Bomotti, S. (1994). Teaching assistant attitudes toward college teaching. Review of Higher Education, 17, 371-393.

Boyer, E. L. (1991). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyle, P. & Boise, B. (1998). Systematic mentoring for new faculty teachers and graduate teaching assistants. Innovative Higher Education, 22, 157.

Buerkel-Rothfuss, N. L. & Gray, P. L. (1990). Graduate teaching assistant training in speech communication and noncommunication departments: A national survey. Communication Education, 39, 292-308.

Civikly, J. M., & Hidalgo, R. (1992). TA training as professional mentoring. In J. D. Nyquist & D. H. Wulff. (Eds.), Preparing teaching assistants for instructional roles: Supervising TAs in communication (pp. 209-213). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Connelly, W. (1982). Training GTAs to teach: Persona, personality, and policy. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 213 046)

D'Andrea, V. (1996). Starting a teaching assistants' training program: Lessons learned in the USA. Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 20, 89.

Duba-Biedermann, L. (1994). Graduate assistant development: Problems of role ambiguity and faculty supervision. Journal of Graduate Teaching Assistant Development, 1, 119-126.

Feezel, J. D. & Myers, S. A. (1997). Assessing graduate assistant communication concerns. Communication Quarterly, 45, 110-125.

Gilbreath, J. A. & Slater, T. F. (1994). Training graduate teaching assistants to be better undergraduate physics educators. Physical Education, 29, 220.

Gray, P. L. & Buerkel-Rothfuss, N. L. (1991). Teaching assistant training: A view from the trenches. In J. D. Nyquist, R. D. Abbott, D. H. Wulff, & J. Sprague (Eds.), Preparing the professorate of tomorrow to teach (pp. 40-51). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Hendrix, K. G. (1995). Preparing graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) to effectively teach the basic course. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern States Communication Association, New Orleans. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 384 933).

Hendrix, K. G. (1999). Peer mentoring for graduate teaching assistants: Training and utilizing a valuable resource. Paper presented at the Central and Southern States Communication Conference, St. Louis, MO.

Hugenberg, L. W. (Ed.). (1991). Basic Communication Course Annual, Volume 3. Boston, MA: American Press.

Jones, J. (1993). TA training: From the TA's point of view. Innovative Higher Education, 18, 147-161.

Instructional resource booklet for graduate teaching assistants at Old Dominion University. Rev. ed. (1987). (Available from Old Dominion University, Center for Instructional Development, 101 Hughes Hall, Norfolk, VA 23529-0028).

Lucas, S. E. (2001a). The art of public speaking. 6th ed. NY: McGraw-Hill.

Lucas, S. E. (2001b). Instructor's manual to accompany the art of public speaking. 6th ed. NY: McGraw-Hill.

Lumsden, A. (1993). Training graduate students to teach. The American Biology Teacher, 55, 233-236.

Mandeville, M. Y. & Blakemore, S. A. (1994). Using the team building approach as a management tool for the training of graduate teaching assistants in the basic speech communication course program. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech

Communication Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 376 535)

McKeachie, W. J. (Ed.). (1999). Teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers. 10th ed. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

New emphasis. (1997). The Scientist, 11, 16.

Nyquist, J. D. & Wulff. D. H. (1986). The training of graduate teaching assistants at the University of Washington. Paper identified by the Task Force on Establishing a National Clearinghouse of Materials Developed by Teaching Assistant (TA) Training. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 289 433)

Rushin, J. W., De Saiz, J., Lunsden, A., Streubel, D. P., Summers, G., & Bernson, C. (1997). Graduate teaching assistant training: A basis for improvement of college biology teaching & faculty development? The American Biology Teacher, 59, 86-91.

Savage, M. P. & Sharpe, T. (1998). Demonstrating the need for formal graduate student training in effective teaching practices. Physical Educator, 55, 130-137.

Sebald, D., Courter, S., Lewis, D. & Baker, M. (1997). Preparation for teaching assistants at the University of Wisconsin, College of Engineering. Proceedings--Frontiers in Education Conference, 3, 1220.

Shannon, D. M., Twale, D. J., & Moore, M. S. (1998). TA teaching effectiveness: The impact of training and teaching experience. Journal of Higher Education, 69, 440-467.

Williamson, L. K. & Morris, C. (2001). Communication 111 handbook. Wichita, KS: Basic Oral Communication Program, Wichita State University.

Williamson, L. K. & Smith, R. M. (1981). In-service instructional training for the basic communication course. Kansas Speech Journal, 42, 9-15.

Worthen, T. K. (1992). The frustrated GTA: A qualitative investigation identifying the needs within the graduate teaching assistant experience. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 355 598)

Yoder, D. D. & Hugenberg, L. W. (1980). A sruvey of in-service teaching training programs for graduate teaching assistants in basic communication courses. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New York, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED 207 106)

Appendix A

Undergraduate Syllabus Course Requirements

(Williamson & Morris, 2001, pg. 4)

9. **Course Requirements**

Assignments	**Points Possible**	**% of Grade**	**Points Earned**
Introduction of Self Speech	ungraded	ungraded	ungraded
One-Point Informative Speech	25	5 %	
Informative Speech	75	15 %	
Library Assignment	10	2 %	
Value Persuasive Speech	85	17 %	
Policy Persuasive Speech	100	20 %	
Speech of Introduction	10	2 %	
Impromptu Speeches (2 @ 5pts.ea.)	10	2 %	
Symposium Speech	10	2 %	
Variable points (pop quizzes, etc.)	20	4 %	
Videotape Evaluation	5	1 %	
Midterm Exam	50	10 %	
Final Exam	100	20 %	
Total Available Points	**500**	**100 %**	

The approximate grading scale is:

90 - 100 % A
80 - 89 % B
70 - 79 % C
60 - 69 % D
Below 60 % F

The exact percentages for the course grade may vary somewhat because the Final Exam will be norm-referenced (i.e., graded on the curve). Students should keep track of all points earned.

Appendix B

Undergraduate Syllabus Course Outline

(Williamson & Morris, 2001, pp. 6-7)

The following tentative Comm 111 course outline is for a regular sixteen-week semester (including finals); for short-term classes, the instructor will indicate schedule adjustments. This course outline does not include any official University holiday breaks or recesses; the instructor will indicate adjustments necessitated by such breaks. The instructor reserves the right to adjust the tentative course outline whenever and however s/he deems advisable.

Week #	Date	Topic/Assignment	Reading Due
1	_____	Introduction/Course overview	
		Speaking in Public	Lucas ch. 1
		INTRODUCTION OF SELF SPEECH	
2	_____	INTRODUCTION OF SELF SPEECH (con't)	
		Selecting a Topic and Purpose	Lucas ch. 4
		General/Specific Purposes	
		Analyzing the Audience	Lucas ch. 5
3	_____	Speaking to Inform (Overview)	Lucas ch. 14
		Listening	Lucas ch. 3
		Ethics and Public Speaking	Lucas ch. 2
4	_____	1-POINT INFORMATIVE SPEECHES	
		Gathering Materials	Lucas ch. 6
		Organizing the Body of the Speech	Lucas ch. 8
5	_____	Outlining the Speech	Lucas ch. 10
		Beginning and Ending the Speech	Lucas ch. 9
6	_____	IMPROMPTU INFORMATIVE SPEECHES	
		Using Visual Aids	Lucas ch. 13
		Supporting Your Ideas	Lucas ch. 7
		Library Assignment due	
7	_____	INFORMATIVE SPEECHES	
		(Bring Videotape)	
8	_____	Speaking to Persuade	Lucas ch. 15
		Videotape Evaluation due (see that section of the Syllabus)	
		MIDTERM EXAM	
		Methods of Persuasion	Lucas ch. 16
9	_____	Using Language	Lucas ch. 11
		Delivery	Lucas ch. 12
10	_____	VALUE PERSUASIVE SPEECHES	

Week #	Date	Topic/Assignment	Reading Due
11	_____	VALUE PERSUASIVE SPEECHES Preview Policy Speech Speaking on Special Occasions Preview Speech of Introduction	Lucas ch. 17
12	_____	IMPROMPTU PERSUASIVE SPEECHES Motivated Sequence Reasoning Speaking in Small Groups	Lucas ch. 18
13	_____	POLICY PERSUASIVE SPEECHES SPEECHES OF INTRODUCTION	
14	_____	POLICY PERSUASIVE SPEECHES SPEECHES OF INTRODUCTION	
15	_____	VARIABLE POINT SPEAKING ASSIGNMENT (Symposium Speech) Course Wrap Up/Review	

Comm 111 Final Exam Schedule

For Regular 16-week semesters (see "Exam Schedule" in WSU Schedule of Courses):

(a) For all **daytime** sections on the main campus: At the one Time/Date in the Schedule of Classes "Exam Schedule" labeled "**Comm 111**" --location to be announced;

(b) For all **daytime** sections at other sites: usual classroom at same day & time as (a);

(c) For all **evening & Saturday** sections at all locations: usual classroom at day & time per evening/Saturday "Exam Schedule" in WSU Schedule of Courses; not the same as (a) and (b).

Summer Session (and other Short-Term formats)

Instructor will announce the final exam schedule.

Write your section's Final Exam information below:

Date: _____

Time: _____

Place: _____

Bring a # 2 pencil.

NOTE: The published "Exam Schedule" in the WSU Schedule of Courses should be considered a contract between the student and WSU. Alternate arrangements should not be requested.

Appendix C

Basic Course Curriculum Guide (excerpt)

(Wk. 1, con't) **2nd 50 min.**

Introduce self, syllabus, texts, etc., including "Instructor Information" at end of Syllabus in H. (Be sure to keep at least two office hours per section taught, as close to class time as possible and on the same campus). Fill in dates for the "Course Outline" in H: Week. 1 is Wk. of Tues., 1/16 (although Sat. classes begin 1/13 and no classes meet on Mon. 1/15, the Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday), Wk. 2 is Wk. of Mon., 1/22, Wk. 3 is Wk. of 1/29, etc. Spring Recess is Mon. 3/19-Sun. 3/25. Last day of class before Finals is Mon., 5/7.

INTRODUCTION-OF-SELF SPEECH. Most or all of the students should give this speech during the latter part of the **first week's class** (regardless of whether the class meets once or several times a week). Have each triad in turn from earlier in the week *stand* before the class, with each member of the triad doing his/her Introduction-of-Self Speech in turn, and remaining standing until all members of the triad have finished. (This method provides some additional support to speakers, who are not by themselves before the class).

3rd 50 min.

INTRODUCTION-OF-SELF SPEECH (con't, if necessary)

Speaking in Public (ch. 1)

Conduct cultural diversity exercise (IM p. 69, #5): present the four metaphors, then have SG's discuss them as IM directs--which metaphor best fits the U.S. today, and which best fits this class?

Student Introduction Questionnaire (H)--have students fill out to hand in during this (or the next) class session. (Ungraded; for instructor's info. only).

[Review public spking & conversation, L p. 28, #2 & 3; discuss L 28, #1.]

[IM, p 70, #6]

Week 2: **1st 50 min.**

INTRODUCTION-OF-SELF SPEECH (con't, if necessary)

2nd 50 min.

Selecting a Topic and Purpose (ch. 4)

Review purpose statements, esp. "tips" L pp. 83-85.

Specific purpose exercises--SG>class: L 93 #2, & pg. 94 #3 with H ("Specific Purpose Statements" + IM118-120).

Explain the difference between Lucas' concept of a "central idea" (which we will not use in Comm 111) and the concept of a "thesis statement" (which we will use)--refer to "Thesis Statement (not Central Idea)" page in H (Additional Resources section).

[Supply gen. purpose, spec. pur., & thesis statemnt --not central idea: L ch 4, p. 94, #4]

3rd 50 min.

Analyzing the Audience (ch. 5)

Audience analysis, L 120, #2 (for informative speeches), with H "Audience Analysis & Adaptation Worksheet Pt. 1." (Before assigning the 3 topics to different Sgs, lead the class thru the following topic: "women's rights"--for audience # 1, a group of male college students; and for audience # 2, a group of female college students).

Additional audience analysis exer., SG→class (IM p. 138 #1)

Abbreviations: ch=chapter; H=Handbook; IM=Instructor's Manual for Lucas; L=Lucas textbook; SG=small group; "SG→class" = from SG discussion to class discussion; VT=videotape; [ ] = back-up or secondary exercises.

Appendix D

GTA Workshop Syllabus (excerpt)

COMM 111--Curriculum Guide (edited for Comm 750C—GTA Workshop)

This Curriculum Guide lists curriculum plans for each week in the course (consistent with the "Course Outline" section in the Handbook). Each paragraph in this Guide is a different activity, listed in preferred order of usage within each unit; don't do back-up exercises until all others in the unit are done. Guidelines for conducting all activities in the Lucas text as referenced in this Curriculum Guide are found in the Lucas Instructor's Manual, by chapter. *This edited Curriculum Guide also provides the approximate 750C daily schedule for Curriculum Guide activities; see "tentative daily schedule" earlier in the 750C Syllabus for further details relevant to the workshop.*

Abbreviations: ch=chapter; H=Handbook; IM=Instructor's Manual for Lucas; L=Lucas textbook; SG=small group; "SG→class" = from SG discussion to class discussion; VT=videotape; [ ] = back-up or secondary exercises;

Comm 750C (GTA Workshop) Day 1, Mon.—Comm 111 Week 1, 1st 50 min.:

Introduction/Course overview

Get-Acquainted Exercise . . . .

Assign INTRODUCTION-OF-SELF SPEECH (1 - 1 1/2 minutes); use IM, pp. 32-33, with the instructor choosing either option C or D. (Completion of this speech carries no grade points in the course, but is required before a student can attempt further speaking assignments in the course. The speech is used to assess the ability of students to speak understandable English. An accent is not a problem *unless* it makes speech hard to understand. See the "Comm 111 Introduction-of-Self Speech: Student Referral Form" memo in the "Instructor Supplement" file for more detailed information on procedures for dealing with students who fail this speech).

Comm 111 Wk. 1, con't--2nd 50 min.

Introduce self, syllabus, texts, etc., including "Instructor Information" at end of Syllabus in H. (Be sure to keep at least two office hours per section taught, as close to class time as possible and on the same campus). Fill in dates for the "Course Outline" in H: Week. 1 is Wk. of Mon., 8/21 (although Sat. classes begin 8/19), Wk. 2 is Wk. of 8/28, Wk. 3 is Wk. of Tues., 9/5 (since 9/2-9/4 is Labor Day Holiday; for once-a-wk. Sat. & Mon. classes, Wk. 3 will be 9/9 or 9/11), etc. M-W-F & T-Th classes get an extra class period during Thanks-giving Wk. (which should be considered a part of Wk. 13 for them). Thanks-giving Recess is Wed. 11/22-Sun. 11/26. Last day of class before Finals is 12/7.

INTRODUCTION-OF-SELF SPEECH. Most or all of the students should give this speech during the latter part of the **first week's class** (regardless of whether the class meets once or several times a week). Have each triad in turn from earlier in the week *stand* before the class, with each member of the triad doing his/her Introduction-of-Self Speech in turn, and remaining standing until all members of the triad have finished. (This method provides some additional support to speakers, who are not by themselves before the class).

3rd 50 min.

INTRODUCTION-OF-SELF SPEECH (con't, if necessary)

Speaking in Public (ch. 1)

Conduct cultural diversity exercise (IM p. 65, #5): present the four metaphors, then have SG's discuss them as IM directs--which metaphor best fits the U.S. today, and which best fits this class?

Student Introduction Questionnaire (H)--have students fill out to hand in during this (or the next) class session. (Ungraded; for instructor's info. only).

[Review public spking & conversation, L p. 29, #2 & 3; discuss L 29, #1.]
[IM, p 66, #6]

Comm 750C (GTA Workshop) Day 2, Tues. A.M.--Comm 111 Week 2: 1st 50 min.
INTRODUCTION-OF-SELF SPEECH (con't, if necessary)

2nd 50 min.

Selecting a Topic and Purpose (ch. 4)

Review purpose statements, esp. "tips" L pp. 85-87.

_____Specific purpose exercises--SG>class: L 96 #2, & #3 with H ("Specific Purpose Statements" + IM110-111).

Explain the difference between Lucas' concept of a "central idea" (which we will not use in Comm 111) and the concept of a "thesis statement" (which we will use)--refer to "Thesis Statement (not Central Idea)" page in H (Additional Resources section).

[Supply gen. purpose, spec. pur., & thesis statemnt --not central idea: L ch 4, p. 96, #4]

3rd 50 min.

Analyzing the Audience (ch. 5)

_____Audience analysis, L 123, #2 (for informative speeches), with H "Audience Analysis & Adaptation Worksheet Pt. 1." (Before assigning the 3 topics to different Sgs, lead the class thru the following topic: "women's rights"--for audience # 1, a group of male college students; and for audience # 2, a group of female college students).

Additional audience analysis exer., SG→class (IM p. 131 #1)